

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
08/992,222	12/17/1007		TOTALET BOOKET NO. CO	CONFIRMATION NO.
	12/17/1997	WILLIAM A. HOBBS		3574
75	11/12/2002			
WILLIAM W.	. KIDD			
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP 12400 WILSHIRE BLVD., 7TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			JEAN, FRANTZ B	
LOS ANGELES	S, CA 90025		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2155	29
			DATE MAILED: 11/12/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	08/992,222	HOBBS ET AL.	
naviosity notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frantz B. Jean	2155	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 September 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the supplication of the supplication with the supplication with the supplication of the s	cation. A proper rep ch places the appli	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate exite fee. The appropriate exite final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
 1.	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		set forth in
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below):	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by		see NOTE below),	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or		erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been consecutions	sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the control of the control	t(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo	o) will be entered ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: 4,3-14,16-19,21-24,31-54	. Cu		
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-14, 16-19, 21-24,3	1-54		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is			niner.
Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		Ma	L.
. Patent and Trademark Office			<u> </u>

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims, as written, are not defined over the prior art of record Gates and Carlsson and applicants' arguments filed on 9/5/02 are not persuasive to put the application in condition fo allowance.